

FOUR DAYS LATE FROM EUROPE.

ARRIVAL OF THE PERIA AND VIGO.

THE ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH COMPANY PROSECUTED.

LATER FROM INDIA AND CHINA.

MORE MUTINIES—BRITISH VICTORIES.

Cotton Steady—Broadcloth Firm—Consols 92 3/4.

The Royal Mail steamship *Peria*, Capt. Jenkins, which sailed from Liverpool at 3 o'clock on the afternoon of the 19th inst., arrived here at 9 o'clock on Tuesday morning.

The new steamer *Vigo*, which left Liverpool on Wednesday, Oct. 13, also arrived on Tuesday morning.

An increased demand for money has been observed in all the principal Continental markets.

The Banks of Prussia (at Berlin) and Frankfurt had raised their rate of discount to 5 per cent.

The French Government had issued a decree ordering to exempt from navigation dues, cargoes of flour, rice, vegetables, &c.

A Barometer was had conferred on Sir James Outram for his Indian services.

Mr. Barber, the recently appointed British Consul for Virginia, has been removed to the Island of Candia, and Mr. George Moore is appointed his successor.

The race for the Cesarewitch handicap at Newmarket, for which the American horse *Princess* was the favorite, was won by *Rocket* by a head only—*Princess* and the *Brewer* running a dead heat for the second place. Thirty-five horses ran.

The ship *Anglo-Saxon* of Boston was at Bathurst on the 25th Sept., with her captain and crew dead of fever. The American bark *Autopole* was lost near Hong Kong.

The steamer *Vanderbilt* arrived at Southampton on the afternoon of the 19th Oct.

THE STATE OF PRUSSIA.

From Our Own Correspondent.

LOSPOX, Friday, Oct. 15, 1858.

The Queen of Prussia has at last surrendered; seeing that even the quietest portion of the Prussian population were becoming excited, she withdrew her opposition against the unconditional Regency of the Prince of Prussia, and the comedy was played out as it had been got up during the last six months. The physicians of the King had to declare that the King was better—a declaration necessary for the legalization of his last act, viz: the unconditional transfer of the Royal power to the Prince—and the poor idiotic Frederick William signed the paper which, without making any reference to the Constitution and Chambers, empowers the Prince to govern Prussia according to his responsibility to God! Frederick William IV., though still retaining the title and civil list of a King, disappears now from the high position he once occupied, and belongs altogether to history. Endowed with the most envied advantages, he was amiable, refined, benevolent, liberal, highly instructed, religious, not only an excellent talker but sometimes really eloquent, a scholar, and a patron of art and science. He lacked one single quality, which would have made him an eminent man in history: courage. He was a coward, physically and morally impotent, and therefore he became a tool of those aristocratic beggars who swarm at German Courts, who feed upon the budget, despite the nation, fear publicity and the most inveterate enemies of liberty in any form. Next to these three in Prussia a narrow-minded, bigoted, and red-tape official, who, in the educated middle class, believing that it is their mission to guide every step of the people, to instruct them, to drill them, to protect them, and to punish them, of course only for reformation's sake, in case they should choose their own way without caring for the prescribed royal road to happiness. The King was surrounded by these two classes of men, and worked as directed by them; but when the court leeches came into conflict with the red tapeists, and Hinkeldey was slain by Raskow, the young aristocratic Lieutenant, the King had but tears for his late friend the President of the Police, and no energy to free himself from the meshes of the reactionary aristocracy. He fully felt his degradation; he could not forget that the leadership of Germany had been in his hands in 1840, and the Imperial crown within his reach in 1849; that Prussia's rank in Europe had been lowered during his reign; that he had had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

His successor, the Prince of Prussia, is neither amiable nor refined; he is not a scholar, not a liberal, not in any way a distinguished man; but he has courage. On account of this quality, the Prussians place the greatest confidence in him. Their hopes are unbounded; they expect from him a reign of progress and reform, and well aware that it was his energy which carried the marriage of his son with the English Princess Royal, against the intrigues of the Queen of Prussia, they really believe that the little Princess has smuggled constitutional law and parliamentary government under her ermine into Prussia. They will soon be undeceived. The Prince of Prussia hates the aristocratic courtiers of his brother—the chattering Puseyite Generals, those medieval Barons without patrimony, the courtiers who were brought up the ruler's arguments about kingly power by the grace of God—and he will turn them out as soon as possible. Count Westphalen has already been dismissed, and Gen. Gerlach accompanies the idiotic King to the south; but the bureaucracy, ever intermeddling, directing and worrying, will flourish under him as proudly as under old Frederick William III. The Prince dislikes self-government, constitution, parliament; his ideal is an enlightened despotism based on competitive examination, a red-tape administration, a well-drilled army and education superintended by the State. The clergyman and the schoolmaster are of the first importance; in fact the conductors of the drill-sergeant, of the army officer, and the police-inspector. He has not yet forgotten the memorable words he uttered about six years ago on the Rhine, or receiving a loyalist address: "The present generation," he deliberately said, "is utterly depraved, imbued with anarchical ideas; we must keep it down by the army and try to educate a better generation untainted by such ideas." These words may be taken as the programme of his reign; they contain no prognostication of constitutional government. The present Prussian enthusiasm may be compared to the submarine cable demonstrations in America, held at the very moment when the cable was becoming unfit for service. While the Liberals at Berlin are rejoicing, we hear already a rumor of the recall of Bismarck-Schoenhausen to the Ministry, a rumor had once for the Constitution, this gentleman being one of the most tedious of red-tapeists.

France must always be in hot water. She now has a squabble on hand with Portugal, about a ship carrying French (3) black emigrants to the colonies. The ship was seized, having come into a forbidden Portuguese port; the emigrants escaped, and Count Walewski now insists upon indemnity and apology. The Portuguese Government has proposed a mediation, and the French Minister has refused it; but Portugal now points to the concluding article of the famous last Treaty of Paris, which says that the contracting powers bind themselves in case of any difficulties, to resort first to mediation; thus Walewski is caught in his own meshes. We do not as yet know the result, but the affair must end in smoke. The complication with Morocco is much more serious. The Vice-Consuls of France and Spain having been

shot at Tetuan, this outrage may serve as a pretext for an expedition against the Moorish Empire, which is coveted by Spain, as well as by France. The Sultan, Abderrahman, is encircled by age, and hated by his subjects for his grasping propensities, one-half of the population being just now actually risen in rebellion against his exactions. What an excellent opportunity for war, glory and annexation! It is a Godsend for both O'Donnell and Napoleon.

THE KING OF PRUSSIA'S INSANITY.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

BERLIN, Oct. 12, 1858.

It was to-day that the King left Berlin en route to Tyrol and Italy. Among the silent crowd waiting at the Potsdam Railway terminus to watch his departure there were many who, in 1840, had assisted at his coronation, and in his first public display of stamp-omancy, heard him solemnly swear that he would never allow a "Gallie bit of paper" to interfere between him and his people.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of the country, and according to Article 56 of the Constitution, convolve the two Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy." Now, in the royal receipt the King is as Regent, and by his own free will, temporarily resigns. The Prince, however, refers at the same time to the "royal request" and to "Article 56 of the Constitution," which assumes the king to be insane or captive, and, consequently, unable to install the Regency himself. The King, furthermore, in his receipt, calls upon the Regent to exercise his power "with responsibility to God alone," while the Prince, by referring to the Constitution, leaves all the responsibility to the existing Ministry. According to the article quoted by the Regent, the "next heir to the throne," has immediately to convolve the Chambers, which in a united sitting, are to decide on the "necessity of the Regency." To take the latter power out of the hands of the Diet, the voluntary resignation of the King is required, but to have the Diet altogether dependent upon the King's caprices, the Constitution was referred to. Thus there is a flaw in the Regent's claim as it professes to proceed from two titles, which extinguish each other. Article 58 of the Constitution, declares that "from the moment of his (the Regent's) oath relative to the Constitution (before the united Diet), the existing Ministry remains responsible for all governmental acts." How does this tally with "the responsibility to God alone?" The acknowledgment of the King's receipt is a pretext, because the Diet is a pretext, because it is not to decide upon the "necessity" of the Regency. By the mere force of circumstances the Prince of Prussia, who, in 1850, declined taking the oath to the Constitution, sees himself now placed in the awkward position of not only accepting, but of appealing to it. It must not be forgotten that from the autumn of 1812 to the beginning of 1850, the Absolutists, especially in the ranks of the army, had cherished, and occasionally, even openly avowed their plan of supplanting the vacillating King by the sober Prince, who, at all events, was not prevented by any elasticity of intellect, from possessing a certain amount of will, and who, furthermore, by his conduct during the days of March, his flight to England, the popular odium centering upon him, and, lastly, his high deeds in the Baden campaign, seemed quite the man to represent strong government in Prussia, as *Fernand Joseph* and the son of *Hortensio* do on the Western and Eastern frontiers of the Hohenzollern domains. The Prince, in fact, has never altered his principles. Yet the slights he, and still more his wife, a disciple of Goethe, a cultivated mind, an ambitious and haughty character, have had to submit to, on the part of the Queen and her camarilla, could not but drive him into a somewhat oppositional attitude. The King's conduct had already been such that he could not but feel that he had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of the country, and according to Article 56 of the Constitution, convolve the two Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy." Now, in the royal receipt the King is as Regent, and by his own free will, temporarily resigns. The Prince, however, refers at the same time to the "royal request" and to "Article 56 of the Constitution," which assumes the king to be insane or captive, and, consequently, unable to install the Regency himself. The King, furthermore, in his receipt, calls upon the Regent to exercise his power "with responsibility to God alone," while the Prince, by referring to the Constitution, leaves all the responsibility to the existing Ministry. According to the article quoted by the Regent, the "next heir to the throne," has immediately to convolve the Chambers, which in a united sitting, are to decide on the "necessity of the Regency." To take the latter power out of the hands of the Diet, the voluntary resignation of the King is required, but to have the Diet altogether dependent upon the King's caprices, the Constitution was referred to. Thus there is a flaw in the Regent's claim as it professes to proceed from two titles, which extinguish each other. Article 58 of the Constitution, declares that "from the moment of his (the Regent's) oath relative to the Constitution (before the united Diet), the existing Ministry remains responsible for all governmental acts." How does this tally with "the responsibility to God alone?" The acknowledgment of the King's receipt is a pretext, because the Diet is a pretext, because it is not to decide upon the "necessity" of the Regency. By the mere force of circumstances the Prince of Prussia, who, in 1850, declined taking the oath to the Constitution, sees himself now placed in the awkward position of not only accepting, but of appealing to it. It must not be forgotten that from the autumn of 1812 to the beginning of 1850, the Absolutists, especially in the ranks of the army, had cherished, and occasionally, even openly avowed their plan of supplanting the vacillating King by the sober Prince, who, at all events, was not prevented by any elasticity of intellect, from possessing a certain amount of will, and who, furthermore, by his conduct during the days of March, his flight to England, the popular odium centering upon him, and, lastly, his high deeds in the Baden campaign, seemed quite the man to represent strong government in Prussia, as *Fernand Joseph* and the son of *Hortensio* do on the Western and Eastern frontiers of the Hohenzollern domains. The Prince, in fact, has never altered his principles. Yet the slights he, and still more his wife, a disciple of Goethe, a cultivated mind, an ambitious and haughty character, have had to submit to, on the part of the Queen and her camarilla, could not but drive him into a somewhat oppositional attitude. The King's conduct had already been such that he could not but feel that he had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of the country, and according to Article 56 of the Constitution, convolve the two Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy." Now, in the royal receipt the King is as Regent, and by his own free will, temporarily resigns. The Prince, however, refers at the same time to the "royal request" and to "Article 56 of the Constitution," which assumes the king to be insane or captive, and, consequently, unable to install the Regency himself. The King, furthermore, in his receipt, calls upon the Regent to exercise his power "with responsibility to God alone," while the Prince, by referring to the Constitution, leaves all the responsibility to the existing Ministry. According to the article quoted by the Regent, the "next heir to the throne," has immediately to convolve the Chambers, which in a united sitting, are to decide on the "necessity of the Regency." To take the latter power out of the hands of the Diet, the voluntary resignation of the King is required, but to have the Diet altogether dependent upon the King's caprices, the Constitution was referred to. Thus there is a flaw in the Regent's claim as it professes to proceed from two titles, which extinguish each other. Article 58 of the Constitution, declares that "from the moment of his (the Regent's) oath relative to the Constitution (before the united Diet), the existing Ministry remains responsible for all governmental acts." How does this tally with "the responsibility to God alone?" The acknowledgment of the King's receipt is a pretext, because the Diet is a pretext, because it is not to decide upon the "necessity" of the Regency. By the mere force of circumstances the Prince of Prussia, who, in 1850, declined taking the oath to the Constitution, sees himself now placed in the awkward position of not only accepting, but of appealing to it. It must not be forgotten that from the autumn of 1812 to the beginning of 1850, the Absolutists, especially in the ranks of the army, had cherished, and occasionally, even openly avowed their plan of supplanting the vacillating King by the sober Prince, who, at all events, was not prevented by any elasticity of intellect, from possessing a certain amount of will, and who, furthermore, by his conduct during the days of March, his flight to England, the popular odium centering upon him, and, lastly, his high deeds in the Baden campaign, seemed quite the man to represent strong government in Prussia, as *Fernand Joseph* and the son of *Hortensio* do on the Western and Eastern frontiers of the Hohenzollern domains. The Prince, in fact, has never altered his principles. Yet the slights he, and still more his wife, a disciple of Goethe, a cultivated mind, an ambitious and haughty character, have had to submit to, on the part of the Queen and her camarilla, could not but drive him into a somewhat oppositional attitude. The King's conduct had already been such that he could not but feel that he had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of the country, and according to Article 56 of the Constitution, convolve the two Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy." Now, in the royal receipt the King is as Regent, and by his own free will, temporarily resigns. The Prince, however, refers at the same time to the "royal request" and to "Article 56 of the Constitution," which assumes the king to be insane or captive, and, consequently, unable to install the Regency himself. The King, furthermore, in his receipt, calls upon the Regent to exercise his power "with responsibility to God alone," while the Prince, by referring to the Constitution, leaves all the responsibility to the existing Ministry. According to the article quoted by the Regent, the "next heir to the throne," has immediately to convolve the Chambers, which in a united sitting, are to decide on the "necessity of the Regency." To take the latter power out of the hands of the Diet, the voluntary resignation of the King is required, but to have the Diet altogether dependent upon the King's caprices, the Constitution was referred to. Thus there is a flaw in the Regent's claim as it professes to proceed from two titles, which extinguish each other. Article 58 of the Constitution, declares that "from the moment of his (the Regent's) oath relative to the Constitution (before the united Diet), the existing Ministry remains responsible for all governmental acts." How does this tally with "the responsibility to God alone?" The acknowledgment of the King's receipt is a pretext, because the Diet is a pretext, because it is not to decide upon the "necessity" of the Regency. By the mere force of circumstances the Prince of Prussia, who, in 1850, declined taking the oath to the Constitution, sees himself now placed in the awkward position of not only accepting, but of appealing to it. It must not be forgotten that from the autumn of 1812 to the beginning of 1850, the Absolutists, especially in the ranks of the army, had cherished, and occasionally, even openly avowed their plan of supplanting the vacillating King by the sober Prince, who, at all events, was not prevented by any elasticity of intellect, from possessing a certain amount of will, and who, furthermore, by his conduct during the days of March, his flight to England, the popular odium centering upon him, and, lastly, his high deeds in the Baden campaign, seemed quite the man to represent strong government in Prussia, as *Fernand Joseph* and the son of *Hortensio* do on the Western and Eastern frontiers of the Hohenzollern domains. The Prince, in fact, has never altered his principles. Yet the slights he, and still more his wife, a disciple of Goethe, a cultivated mind, an ambitious and haughty character, have had to submit to, on the part of the Queen and her camarilla, could not but drive him into a somewhat oppositional attitude. The King's conduct had already been such that he could not but feel that he had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of the country, and according to Article 56 of the Constitution, convolve the two Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy." Now, in the royal receipt the King is as Regent, and by his own free will, temporarily resigns. The Prince, however, refers at the same time to the "royal request" and to "Article 56 of the Constitution," which assumes the king to be insane or captive, and, consequently, unable to install the Regency himself. The King, furthermore, in his receipt, calls upon the Regent to exercise his power "with responsibility to God alone," while the Prince, by referring to the Constitution, leaves all the responsibility to the existing Ministry. According to the article quoted by the Regent, the "next heir to the throne," has immediately to convolve the Chambers, which in a united sitting, are to decide on the "necessity of the Regency." To take the latter power out of the hands of the Diet, the voluntary resignation of the King is required, but to have the Diet altogether dependent upon the King's caprices, the Constitution was referred to. Thus there is a flaw in the Regent's claim as it professes to proceed from two titles, which extinguish each other. Article 58 of the Constitution, declares that "from the moment of his (the Regent's) oath relative to the Constitution (before the united Diet), the existing Ministry remains responsible for all governmental acts." How does this tally with "the responsibility to God alone?" The acknowledgment of the King's receipt is a pretext, because the Diet is a pretext, because it is not to decide upon the "necessity" of the Regency. By the mere force of circumstances the Prince of Prussia, who, in 1850, declined taking the oath to the Constitution, sees himself now placed in the awkward position of not only accepting, but of appealing to it. It must not be forgotten that from the autumn of 1812 to the beginning of 1850, the Absolutists, especially in the ranks of the army, had cherished, and occasionally, even openly avowed their plan of supplanting the vacillating King by the sober Prince, who, at all events, was not prevented by any elasticity of intellect, from possessing a certain amount of will, and who, furthermore, by his conduct during the days of March, his flight to England, the popular odium centering upon him, and, lastly, his high deeds in the Baden campaign, seemed quite the man to represent strong government in Prussia, as *Fernand Joseph* and the son of *Hortensio* do on the Western and Eastern frontiers of the Hohenzollern domains. The Prince, in fact, has never altered his principles. Yet the slights he, and still more his wife, a disciple of Goethe, a cultivated mind, an ambitious and haughty character, have had to submit to, on the part of the Queen and her camarilla, could not but drive him into a somewhat oppositional attitude. The King's conduct had already been such that he could not but feel that he had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of the country, and according to Article 56 of the Constitution, convolve the two Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy." Now, in the royal receipt the King is as Regent, and by his own free will, temporarily resigns. The Prince, however, refers at the same time to the "royal request" and to "Article 56 of the Constitution," which assumes the king to be insane or captive, and, consequently, unable to install the Regency himself. The King, furthermore, in his receipt, calls upon the Regent to exercise his power "with responsibility to God alone," while the Prince, by referring to the Constitution, leaves all the responsibility to the existing Ministry. According to the article quoted by the Regent, the "next heir to the throne," has immediately to convolve the Chambers, which in a united sitting, are to decide on the "necessity of the Regency." To take the latter power out of the hands of the Diet, the voluntary resignation of the King is required, but to have the Diet altogether dependent upon the King's caprices, the Constitution was referred to. Thus there is a flaw in the Regent's claim as it professes to proceed from two titles, which extinguish each other. Article 58 of the Constitution, declares that "from the moment of his (the Regent's) oath relative to the Constitution (before the united Diet), the existing Ministry remains responsible for all governmental acts." How does this tally with "the responsibility to God alone?" The acknowledgment of the King's receipt is a pretext, because the Diet is a pretext, because it is not to decide upon the "necessity" of the Regency. By the mere force of circumstances the Prince of Prussia, who, in 1850, declined taking the oath to the Constitution, sees himself now placed in the awkward position of not only accepting, but of appealing to it. It must not be forgotten that from the autumn of 1812 to the beginning of 1850, the Absolutists, especially in the ranks of the army, had cherished, and occasionally, even openly avowed their plan of supplanting the vacillating King by the sober Prince, who, at all events, was not prevented by any elasticity of intellect, from possessing a certain amount of will, and who, furthermore, by his conduct during the days of March, his flight to England, the popular odium centering upon him, and, lastly, his high deeds in the Baden campaign, seemed quite the man to represent strong government in Prussia, as *Fernand Joseph* and the son of *Hortensio* do on the Western and Eastern frontiers of the Hohenzollern domains. The Prince, in fact, has never altered his principles. Yet the slights he, and still more his wife, a disciple of Goethe, a cultivated mind, an ambitious and haughty character, have had to submit to, on the part of the Queen and her camarilla, could not but drive him into a somewhat oppositional attitude. The King's conduct had already been such that he could not but feel that he had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of the country, and according to Article 56 of the Constitution, convolve the two Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy." Now, in the royal receipt the King is as Regent, and by his own free will, temporarily resigns. The Prince, however, refers at the same time to the "royal request" and to "Article 56 of the Constitution," which assumes the king to be insane or captive, and, consequently, unable to install the Regency himself. The King, furthermore, in his receipt, calls upon the Regent to exercise his power "with responsibility to God alone," while the Prince, by referring to the Constitution, leaves all the responsibility to the existing Ministry. According to the article quoted by the Regent, the "next heir to the throne," has immediately to convolve the Chambers, which in a united sitting, are to decide on the "necessity of the Regency." To take the latter power out of the hands of the Diet, the voluntary resignation of the King is required, but to have the Diet altogether dependent upon the King's caprices, the Constitution was referred to. Thus there is a flaw in the Regent's claim as it professes to proceed from two titles, which extinguish each other. Article 58 of the Constitution, declares that "from the moment of his (the Regent's) oath relative to the Constitution (before the united Diet), the existing Ministry remains responsible for all governmental acts." How does this tally with "the responsibility to God alone?" The acknowledgment of the King's receipt is a pretext, because the Diet is a pretext, because it is not to decide upon the "necessity" of the Regency. By the mere force of circumstances the Prince of Prussia, who, in 1850, declined taking the oath to the Constitution, sees himself now placed in the awkward position of not only accepting, but of appealing to it. It must not be forgotten that from the autumn of 1812 to the beginning of 1850, the Absolutists, especially in the ranks of the army, had cherished, and occasionally, even openly avowed their plan of supplanting the vacillating King by the sober Prince, who, at all events, was not prevented by any elasticity of intellect, from possessing a certain amount of will, and who, furthermore, by his conduct during the days of March, his flight to England, the popular odium centering upon him, and, lastly, his high deeds in the Baden campaign, seemed quite the man to represent strong government in Prussia, as *Fernand Joseph* and the son of *Hortensio* do on the Western and Eastern frontiers of the Hohenzollern domains. The Prince, in fact, has never altered his principles. Yet the slights he, and still more his wife, a disciple of Goethe, a cultivated mind, an ambitious and haughty character, have had to submit to, on the part of the Queen and her camarilla, could not but drive him into a somewhat oppositional attitude. The King's conduct had already been such that he could not but feel that he had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of the country, and according to Article 56 of the Constitution, convolve the two Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy." Now, in the royal receipt the King is as Regent, and by his own free will, temporarily resigns. The Prince, however, refers at the same time to the "royal request" and to "Article 56 of the Constitution," which assumes the king to be insane or captive, and, consequently, unable to install the Regency himself. The King, furthermore, in his receipt, calls upon the Regent to exercise his power "with responsibility to God alone," while the Prince, by referring to the Constitution, leaves all the responsibility to the existing Ministry. According to the article quoted by the Regent, the "next heir to the throne," has immediately to convolve the Chambers, which in a united sitting, are to decide on the "necessity of the Regency." To take the latter power out of the hands of the Diet, the voluntary resignation of the King is required, but to have the Diet altogether dependent upon the King's caprices, the Constitution was referred to. Thus there is a flaw in the Regent's claim as it professes to proceed from two titles, which extinguish each other. Article 58 of the Constitution, declares that "from the moment of his (the Regent's) oath relative to the Constitution (before the united Diet), the existing Ministry remains responsible for all governmental acts." How does this tally with "the responsibility to God alone?" The acknowledgment of the King's receipt is a pretext, because the Diet is a pretext, because it is not to decide upon the "necessity" of the Regency. By the mere force of circumstances the Prince of Prussia, who, in 1850, declined taking the oath to the Constitution, sees himself now placed in the awkward position of not only accepting, but of appealing to it. It must not be forgotten that from the autumn of 1812 to the beginning of 1850, the Absolutists, especially in the ranks of the army, had cherished, and occasionally, even openly avowed their plan of supplanting the vacillating King by the sober Prince, who, at all events, was not prevented by any elasticity of intellect, from possessing a certain amount of will, and who, furthermore, by his conduct during the days of March, his flight to England, the popular odium centering upon him, and, lastly, his high deeds in the Baden campaign, seemed quite the man to represent strong government in Prussia, as *Fernand Joseph* and the son of *Hortensio* do on the Western and Eastern frontiers of the Hohenzollern domains. The Prince, in fact, has never altered his principles. Yet the slights he, and still more his wife, a disciple of Goethe, a cultivated mind, an ambitious and haughty character, have had to submit to, on the part of the Queen and her camarilla, could not but drive him into a somewhat oppositional attitude. The King's conduct had already been such that he could not but feel that he had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of the country, and according to Article 56 of the Constitution, convolve the two Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy." Now, in the royal receipt the King is as Regent, and by his own free will, temporarily resigns. The Prince, however, refers at the same time to the "royal request" and to "Article 56 of the Constitution," which assumes the king to be insane or captive, and, consequently, unable to install the Regency himself. The King, furthermore, in his receipt, calls upon the Regent to exercise his power "with responsibility to God alone," while the Prince, by referring to the Constitution, leaves all the responsibility to the existing Ministry. According to the article quoted by the Regent, the "next heir to the throne," has immediately to convolve the Chambers, which in a united sitting, are to decide on the "necessity of the Regency." To take the latter power out of the hands of the Diet, the voluntary resignation of the King is required, but to have the Diet altogether dependent upon the King's caprices, the Constitution was referred to. Thus there is a flaw in the Regent's claim as it professes to proceed from two titles, which extinguish each other. Article 58 of the Constitution, declares that "from the moment of his (the Regent's) oath relative to the Constitution (before the united Diet), the existing Ministry remains responsible for all governmental acts." How does this tally with "the responsibility to God alone?" The acknowledgment of the King's receipt is a pretext, because the Diet is a pretext, because it is not to decide upon the "necessity" of the Regency. By the mere force of circumstances the Prince of Prussia, who, in 1850, declined taking the oath to the Constitution, sees himself now placed in the awkward position of not only accepting, but of appealing to it. It must not be forgotten that from the autumn of 1812 to the beginning of 1850, the Absolutists, especially in the ranks of the army, had cherished, and occasionally, even openly avowed their plan of supplanting the vacillating King by the sober Prince, who, at all events, was not prevented by any elasticity of intellect, from possessing a certain amount of will, and who, furthermore, by his conduct during the days of March, his flight to England, the popular odium centering upon him, and, lastly, his high deeds in the Baden campaign, seemed quite the man to represent strong government in Prussia, as *Fernand Joseph* and the son of *Hortensio* do on the Western and Eastern frontiers of the Hohenzollern domains. The Prince, in fact, has never altered his principles. Yet the slights he, and still more his wife, a disciple of Goethe, a cultivated mind, an ambitious and haughty character, have had to submit to, on the part of the Queen and her camarilla, could not but drive him into a somewhat oppositional attitude. The King's conduct had already been such that he could not but feel that he had to eat his own words at Berlin; that he had lost the honor of his crown at Schleswig-Holstein, and that it was dragged through the mud in Neufchatel. His reign was a series of the highest aspirations and continual degradations. His character has been described already by Tacitus, who drew it as if he had known him full eighteen centuries ago, in the words: *Dignissimus imperio, nulli impatiens*. He would have been believed the most worthy to reign, had he never reigned.

The same man had the misfortune not only to accept on his oath a "Gallie bit of paper"—a romantic byword this for a written charter or constitution—but to become himself the god-father of the Prussian Constitution, and, in a certain sense, to be de-throned by virtue of that same mischievous "bit of paper." You will have remarked the discrepancy existing between the king's receipt to the Prince of Prussia and the Prince's receipt to the Ministry. The king in his receipt says: "continuing to be personally kindred from conducting public affairs, I request your Royal Highness and Lieben to the time being, etc., to exercise the kingly power as Regent in my name, according to your best knowledge and conscience, and with responsibility to God alone." The Prince, in his counter-receipt, says: "In consequence of this Royal request and under virtue of Article 56 of the Constitution I being the next male heir to the throne, hereby take upon myself the Regency of